

**TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY OF MARIN (TAM)
SPECIAL WORKSHOP MEETING
SATURDAY, MARCH 5, 2005**

Commissioners Present: Chair Steve Kinsey, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Vice Chair Al Boro, San Rafael City Council
Amy Belser, Sausalito City Council
Peter Breen, San Anselmo Town Council
Jerry Butler, Belvedere City Council
Pat Eklund, Novato City Council
Alice Fredericks, Tiburon Town Council
Melissa Gill, Corte Madera Town Council
Joan Lundstrom, Larkspur City Council
Charles McGlashan, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Cynthia Murray, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Dick Swanson, Mill Valley City Council
Lew Tremaine, Fairfax Town Council

Representatives Absent: Susan Adams, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Hal Brown, Marin County Board of Supervisors
Tom Byrnes, Ross Town Council

Staff Members Present: Craig Tackabery, Executive Director
Dean Powell, Principal Transportation Planner, Marin County DPW
Art Brook, Transportation Engineer, Marin County DPW
Tho Do, Associate Engineer, Marin County DPW
JeriLynne Stewart, Recording Secretary

Chairman Kinsey called the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) Special Workshop to order at 8:50 a.m.

1. Welcome

Chair Kinsey welcomed everyone to the special TAM workshop, stressing the importance of the beginning of the formation and foundation of the Authority. He thanked staff, community stakeholders, and individuals who have participated in the past with the former Congestion Management Agency (CMA) and now with the creation of the new Authority. Chair Kinsey asked attendees to consider what excellence means, and what can the Authority do to achieve a long-standing contribution to the future of Marin County. He urged attendees to think in broad, bold terms and to consider beneficial progress for the Authority one step at a time. Our job is to think about the entire community, about the important “voices” who rely on public transportation yet who may not be present today.

2. Executive Director's Report

Executive Director (ED) Craig Tackabery distributed a handout, *Additional Federal STP/CMAQ Funding – Cycle 1 Augmentation, Proposal for Discussion (2/22/05)*, and thanked the work of MTC's staff, particularly Ross McKeown, for ensuring all Bay Area agencies met its deadlines when applying for federal funding. Due to this excellent fiscal management, \$105M in funding has become available to address near-term transportation needs. The handout details the policy's development and programming, which is to be

expedited based on a tight schedule, beginning with the Finance Working Group review March 9, 2005 and ending with the Obligation Deadline (E-76 Approval) on August 1, 2005.

Staff will work expeditiously to ensure Marin County receives its share of the \$105M. As Marin is now a Self-Help County, we are eligible to receive this funding for the 101 HOV Gap Closure Project. The handout also shows the Highway 101 HOV Gap Closure Project to be one of the most critical in the region. Mr. Tackabery highlighted the STIP funding (\$35,416,000) and the 60% STP/CMAQ funding being proposed for Marin (\$21,249,600), the sponsor total match funding (\$17,708,000); TAM set aside \$25M from the sales tax for this project. Staff will bring a STIP amendment, an amendment to the agreement with Caltrans, and a sales tax allocation to the March/April meetings. Caltrans is getting ready to deliver this on schedule to ensure a January 2006 construction start time.

The fact that Marin is now a Self-Help County and eligible for such federal funding is a positive step forward. Mr. Tackabery also explained the proposed STP/CMAQ distribution for local streets and roads, which is \$1.2M. Countywide Public Works Directors are working on prioritization of ready-to-go individual projects to get this money spent quickly. The handout also showed supplemental funding for GGBH&TD's ferry components and replacements.

Mr. Tackabery spoke about a press release from Congresswomen Lynn Woolsey's office, and explained the House Committee has released its latest version of TEA-LU, which includes \$15M for the Marin-Sonoma Narrows Project, plus \$500K for a bike/ped project – a \$2M increase since the Committee's last version.

At a recent Self-Help Counties Coalition meeting, Mr. Tackabery said Marin County is now being considered as host of its annual conference, which boasts 500 attendees.

3. Organizational Issues

a. Introduction of Carmen Clark

Ms. Clark is an organizational development consultant and the former Executive Director (ED) of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority.

b. Summary of Organizational Analysis and Near Term Organizational Issues

In TAM's Work Program (WP), two issues have been discussed: 1) how TAM should be organized, if it is to be an independent agency, what type of staffing it requires, etc.; and 2) what TAM's relationship to MCTD and the CWPA will be. Ms. Clark referred to her report, *Preliminary Organizational Analysis*, and explained that organizational start-up is always difficult. This next year is extremely important in that we must focus on what the organization needs to become in order to carry out the mandate of the voters. The TAM Board needs to discuss and direct staff and specified consultants on how it sees itself functioning related to the County's function, and how it relates to its Oversight Committee functions, who can often work as adjunct staff to TAM. Ms. Clark reviewed current roles and responsibilities of the CWPA, MCTD, and TAM within the County, and indicated four important goals of the TAM organizational plan.

Ms. Clark created and depicted four staffing scenarios based on budget, staffing functions and project size. Scenario #1 is based on the existing structure, featuring 4 full time equivalents (FTE's). The upside of sharing personnel (between TAM and the County) is that TAM receives access to high-level, senior-level expertise yet does not pay the full burden. The downside is the ambiguity involved between being a funding agency to the agency with which it shares staff. How much autonomy does the Agency need and want? Commissioner Boro confirmed in this scenario TAM would contract with the County, yet the key is finding opportunities to employ existing staffs that understand TAM's systems, problems, and the community; they

would just perform their jobs under a different umbrella. Chair Kinsey clarified the fact that during the transitional and planning period, TAM has made some agreements that for an 18-month period, it will continue to use County employees for services for whatever structure TAM chooses as a long-term structure. Mr. Tackabery said there is a need to bring on TAM staff during this 18-month period to enable an overlap of training.

Scenario #2 is a continuation of the current structure with a senior level planner and engineer, yet adds a senior level financial manager plus an administrative assistant.

Scenario #3 also assumes the same staffing division, yet has only 2 senior level managers who report to the ED, one who has a combination of planning and programming duties, and another who is a combination of financial and implementation duties. Development and implementation are clearly divided.

Scenario #4 has 5 FTE's, who are all direct reports to the ED. The advantage is that it is more of a matrix or team scenario; it is much more flexible and works best for an independent agency.

Ms. Clark provided questions for discussion, such as what does TAM feel are the expectations of the voters, what changes need to be made in how TAM does business now, and how will TAM determine the "best fit" for the method in which TAM carries out its duties?

To the extent that TAM has a salary for a manager of the Regional Measure 2 (RM2) Project, if it is portrayed as a position in Ms. Clark's organizational chart, it might imply an impaction issue going up if TAM does not incrementally increase all of the salaries of the managers above this Project Manager position. Chair Kinsey said TAM should benchmark against what this position costs the Authority, to get a better understanding of the implications as depicted in this chart.

Ms. Clark said it is important to first focus on the near term issues, informed by the background information provided in her analysis.

Commissioner Eklund asked that regarding all of the scenarios, is the Board to assume that TAM would be an independent agency and contract with the County; therefore, would Scenario #4 be the only choice which depicts the Authority as an independent agency? Ms. Clark explained all scenarios could function either way, yet Scenario #4 would function best if the Authority were very independent of the County. She explained that all scenarios assume that TAM does not include any of the CWPA functions. Ms. Clark said that if TAM chose to pull in the desirable CWPA functions into its mission, then staff would need to be increased. The org chart would look similar to what she created; yet, there would be more functions listed.

Commissioner Swanson said that if other functions were to be augmented to TAM, they would not necessarily influence the financial issues; they would be funded somewhat independently. Ms. Clark said she was assuming that the roles of the CMA functions already being carried out are sufficient for TAM's continued eligibility to continue its work. She said there is a desire by TAM Commissioners to fund a more aggressive level of land use planning. TAM's challenge is to shape the land use and quality of life issues in a way that compliments transportation decisions it must make. Land use staffing has to be funded; TAM needs to find a way to do this, whether staffing is derived from the County or from TAM.

Commissioner Breen said TAM may be comfortable with the amalgam of funding from Measure A, RM2, and CMA to cover land use staffing because if TAM cannot cover new positions from the start, the relevance begins to wane; then the Board brings things in simply to generate funding. The Board's intention is to get the projects underway. Ms. Clark said TAM would not look as robust as others in terms of the number of employees would. TAM must creatively choose the right employees for the right projects in its core group,

and then utilize its PMO team in creative ways. She said there are sufficient funds now for 2 additional FTE's.

The issue of contracting versus County employees creates partial FTE's for some of the different responsibilities, yet if TAM brings the employees over (in an independent agency), they will need to make the positions whole, according to Chair Kinsey. Commissioner Murray said we need to look at what the budget allows and what is the constancy of that money. TAM does not want to have employees based on one-years' money, if it does not know if it will have the money the following year. She prefers contracting employees, especially with regard to the benefit structure.

Scenario #4, on its face, seems to make the most sense, according to Commissioner Tremaine, in that it is appealing to consider 6 FTE's. Ms. Clark explained that the scenarios all illustrate legally mandated requirements, as a CMA and a sales tax agency. She recommended and set the minimum levels.

Commissioner Boro suggested the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Citizens Oversight Committee (OC) is included/noted on the organizational chart. In addition, how does the MCTD fit in? He agreed that contract employees are the preferred method for assigning duties. He asked Carmen Clark to recommend what TAM's first steps should be, and what does that look like? How do we begin building so that we start running from the start, and then what does she recommend TAM ultimately be, as an agency?

Commissioner Swanson said the money available via Measure A is set by the cap issue, which will fund certain portions of the org chart. Yet, other money –from CMA, MTC, etc. – augments funding for staff. There are other ways to fund staffing which are not portrayed via Ms. Clark's charts. For example, in the Alameda County CMA, there's a lot of staff available basically charged to the projects, which come out of project expenses charged to the programs, as opposed to falling under the administrative cap. This method of funding is not depicted in Ms. Clark's analysis. Commissioner Swanson said it would be helpful to review an actual "envelope of funding," how it's partitioned, how much funding is available, what percentage of these people are funded this way, and what other opportunities beyond that to perform certain functions of TAM, beyond the constrained sources, i.e., federal funding, etc. He asked for clarification as to who is contracting and for what.

TAM can put together a budget illustrating the revenue sources for funding positions. Now that Ms. Clark has shown the core work responsibilities, Chair Kinsey suggested that she also illustrate the “bouquet” around the core; the idea of Counsel should be discussed to determine whether TAM would want to contract with the County. An auditing function may very well be needed and contracted. Today, we may not have time to delve into the relationship between TAM and the MCTD. The issue of growth management, land use, and issues of planning and community building need to also be addressed. We need to identify some of the areas that the TAM Board feels would be useful, while retaining the local planning decision-making at the local level. Chair Kinsey said we know the skill set of the RM2 Manager, and now have a manager on board (Bill Whitney); we need the ability to have some of the cost estimating using the RM2 Manager position as a benchmark for going up and down within the organization.

c. Summary of Transportation Agency Survey and Relationship to Marin County Transit District (MCTD) and Countywide Planning Agency (CWPA)

Commissioner McGlashan asked for analysis among the differing scenarios on how to best deal with the CWPA, and how it is to be addressed among the organizational structure. Ms. Clark said in creating the org chart, she focused on the budget; how many positions TAM wishes to authorize for the coming year. She said lines need to be drawn between required land use planning functions and desired functions.

d. Review of Brochure, Process, and Timeline for Executive Director Recruitment

The TAM Executive Committee (Ex Comm.) has been working on behalf of the Authority to develop the ED's job description, the brochure, and the timeline for recruitment. A revised recruitment schedule (a/o 2-28-05) was distributed. The goal of the Ex Comm.'s next meeting is to give the authorization to proceed with the recruitment mid-March, with the goal of having an ED on board by the beginning of FY 2005-06. Issues and priorities are identified on page 4 of the draft brochure. The compensation piece is to be left open and negotiable. The Ex Comm. agreed that it wanted to review the ability to provide some type of housing allowance or opportunity if that is necessary for the candidate to take on his/her responsibilities for TAM.

Commissioner Murray said CPS has done a good job in reflecting TAM's needs via the brochure. Commissioner McGlashan offered that in the "Ideal Candidate" section of the brochure, it would be good to include a request for experience with transit-oriented development and land use planning, as well as transportation planning. He said TAM would like someone who had strong TOD, in-fill, and smart-growth philosophical leanings. Commissioner Tremaine said that although desirable, he felt TAM would need additional staffing for the aforementioned expertise. Commissioner McGlashan said that in order to utilize the funding in an optimal manner, he would rather find an ED who has the smart-growth philosophical leaning; because we would much rather hire an ED who thinks about smart-growth, especially when he/she is discussing bus routes, not necessarily a driver of the CWP, per se.

Commissioner Eklund agreed that some verbiage be included to reflect the candidate have transit-oriented experience. She also questioned (page 4, first paragraph) whether TAM had made the decision of "Contracted services may be an integral part of Authority operations in the years ahead..." Possibly for the auditor, counsel, for the consultants who will work on congestion management programs, we know that there will be contracted services, according to Chair Kinsey. Actual staffing is still being developed, and it would be the responsibility of the ED to make those choices, therefore it would be advantageous for the ED to be with the TAM Board when it makes the final decisions. Commissioner Eklund said it is unclear how many FTE's will be appointed by the ED. The ED would be on board, and able to assist the TAM Board with FTE staffing recruitment. She asked that verbiage be included to reflect this fact. She said TAM has not made the decision about whether it will contract for the employees. Commissioner Boro suggested the language be "...contracted services MAY be an integral part..." On page 2, Commissioner Eklund referred to the phrase, "...the Board of Commissioners will appoint the ..." She questioned whether TAM would select or hire them. Ms. Clark said if TAM intends the person to serve at the pleasure of TAM, then it is an "appointment." She said it depends on the terms of the Administrative Code and the terms of the contract to be negotiated with the person, even at-will.

There will be a professional panel that between will do the original paper screening then, there will be a panel review, consisting of peer professionals and community stakeholders, as well as the Ex Comm., doing an interview screening, to boil down the number of candidates to one and three, who will then be brought in front of the full Commission and in closed session.

4. Review of 18-Month Work Program (WP) **a. Introduction of Nolte Associates Consultant Team**

ED Craig Tackabery explained that TAM had a consultant selection process panel consisting of Jean Bonander, Pat Echols, Craig Tackabery, Dean Powell, and the ED of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, who selected the team led by Walnut Creek's Nolte Associates, which currently manages Contra Costa County Transportation Authorities. The Project Manager for Contra Costa (and now) Marin counties is Trudy Presser.

Ms. Presser introduced the Nolte Associates team providing hands-on services to TAM. She introduced 9 key team players, whose expertise range from management systems, to project development, highway and roadway project oversight, financial management, public outreach, transit systems oversight, congestion management, local infrastructure oversight, and Congestion Management Program (CMP) and historical knowledge.

ED Tackabery spoke about the institution's creation process, identifying 6 issues. Options are to select outside counsel or formalize the County Counsel relationship with TAM, and contract outside of the County when there are conflict of interest issues or issues of specialized interest. He explained the need for a financial advisor, and how he has discussed a similar RFQ process used by the Sonoma County Transportation Authority Director, Suzanne Wilford, for consideration. The historical Scope of Work might change for the outside auditor with the role of Citizen's Oversight Committee. Historically, the Marin County CMA has not had a contract with state or federal legislative consultants; we have worked through the County, which has legislative representation. If TAM becomes an independent agency, it may want its own legislative representation for its own legislative agenda. This would have a fiscal impact.

Before TAM has an employee in place, basic benefits needed include Worker's Compensation insurance and liability insurance. Mr. Tackabery is gleaning this type of specified information from Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART). For health, vision and dental, SMART contracts with Sonoma County, an option that can be applied similarly in Marin. SMART is pursuing PERS for retirement benefits. TAM could pursue this or County options. Within the next year, Mr. Tackabery said we could develop a new member orientation process.

With respect to institution creation, Commissioner McGlashan asked if it was possible to add CWPA functions. Mr. Tackabery explained that the CWPA is led by the County Community Development Agency's Director, Alex Hinds, and the current make-up of the CWPA includes one of the five Supervisors. There may need to be a joint meeting of the two bodies to address Commissioner McGlashan's concerns. Commissioner Fredericks questioned whether the "Institution Creation" section was in need of being finely broken down, to include countywide planning. Does this need to be explicitly listed in the WP for the next 18-months? ED Tackabery said TAM may want the decisions made and in-place for the new ED to know what kind of job they're getting into, or another option is to wait until the new ED is on board to have this conversation take place.

Commissioner Breen said the Ex Comm. could review all 6 of the issues and report back to the full Board with recommendations within the next 6 months. These issues are over and above the institution's creation; they are pieces of its activities. TAM has to know what its goal is; is it going to be a separate agency? If so, that will influence how planning/staffing issues are decided. Should the Ex Comm. pursue this? Contracting with the County is advantageous for the interim, Commissioner Boro said. He said that for now, it would also be advantageous to use existing County facilities. It was requested that these issues be put on the Ex Comm. agenda for discussion.

Commissioner McGlashan requested to revisit the issue of the CWPA and its role with TAM. TAM is going to be so busy doing an effective job carrying out the build-out of our local transportation system that it is hard to imagine this body carrying out effectively the Countywide planning functions. Yet, he said it is hard to imagine the CWPA finding another night, every month, to do that job, too. Functionally, we have to drive together the philosophies and thought-processes of in-fill; can the TAM Board assist in pulling this off? ED Tackabery said that the consultant strongly felt that TAM needs to focus on getting off the ground, and recommended the CWPA piece be Step 2 in TAM's process. Commissioner Eklund strongly recommended a discussion on this issue, based on the Work Program timeline/flow-chart.

Chair Kinsey requested a Straw Poll of the TAM Boards' mind-set as to whether or not TAM, regardless of how much more it embraces, in its capacity as a sales tax authority & CMA, sees itself as an independent agency going forward. Commissioner Murray requested a definition of "independent". Commissioner Swanson said that independence stands for "autonomy", and the flexibility and options of contracting back with the County for the same functions it may do now as staff to the agency; however, it would have the option to look toward alternative means to perform those services. He said he felt, in order for the agency to work better, TAM needs to move toward independent agency status.

Chair Kinsey asked for those who favor the Authority going forward as an independent agency, as opposed to continuing as a managed agency run by the County, please raise their hand. The Straw Poll was unanimous in favor of becoming an independent agency. We will, however, continue with TAM's needs assessment.

Commissioner Fredericks said this is an opportunity to link land use and transportation planning. When we come to the issue, we need to think of the issue as framed by the need to link the two activities, rather than framed as a need to define our role as a CWPA. This gives us an opportunity to explore a subcommittee with Countywide Planning, or with whatever structure works for us. Commissioner Tremaine said we need to be clear on how we feel about this, because it could have a real bearing on who applies for ED.

ED Craig Tackabery said staff would further develop options to the six institution creation items identified, and bring them to the Ex Comm. then to the full Board for further discussion.

b. Presentation of Work Program Elements, Process, and Timeline Issues

A detailed overview and PowerPoint presentation of the team's goals and WP were given, plus TAM's institution creation and key management issues. Ms. Presser presented Governance, Communication & Coordination org chart, consisting of the TAM Board, auditors, citizens, legal counsel, state and federal agencies, plus individual professional teams and organizations such as the MCTD, school district, public works directors, and the Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit Authority. She discussed the 4 major components of Nolte's Strategic Plan, schedule, a financial overview and management objectives, including financial and accounting, forecasting and tracking, budgeting and project monitoring processes.

Trudy Presser detailed the Strategic Plan schedule, and that a draft is needed by March 2006 at the latest. She said there would be a public hearing in April 2006, then a 45-day comment period, and finally to adopt the plan no later than June 2006. Ms. Presser said a clear decision process must be documented, and spelled out via policy and procedures. In advance of completing the strategic plan, she said Nolte Associates would run financial models for the TAM Board, allowing knowledge of potential cash reserves once the sales tax starts being collected. Finally, she stressed the importance of learning how TAM wishes to communicate this effort (via monthly status reports, for example) to lay out the work that is being accomplished.

Mary Klingensmith of Nolte Associates, gave a financial management overview and basic tasks of start-up, and listed the 3 fundamental areas of importance: 1) TAM's policies and procedures, 2) the strategic plan and 3) the Congestion Management Plan. Ms. Klingensmith said she agreed the new Authority would need to hire a financial manager as soon as possible. For financial legitimacy and credibility, having a TAM staff person on board in the fiduciary role would be critical. She detailed several financial management processes, near-term and long-term. She identified some simple objectives, such as to enhance TAM as a credible financial institution, to provide a solid foundation for the strategic planning effort, and to provide effective tracking and forecasting.

Ms. Klingensmith said an important task for her will be meeting with County and TAM staff to get an understanding of the existing County accounting system, to define the outputs they will need, and the constraints they will be operating within. They will devise a TAM financial database, which will allow for a basic, programmatic system of cash flow. One longer-term tool of particular importance is one which coordinates with the accounting system, which allows Nolte to track and report on TAM's allocations and disbursements. Finally, the budgeting process is a financial translation of the annual Work Program, and a coordination exercise between the team, County staff, and the Marin Managers Association.

Nancy Whelan of Nancy Whelan Consulting gave a financial strategies overview, and highlighted 4 issues to be addressed right away: 1) policy and procedures, used to guide the strategic planning effort, such as a distribution schedule, audit requirements and the timely use of funds. Project sponsors will be the primary audience of this document: what do the sponsors need to bring to TAM, and for TAM's purposes, how it spends its money. The document will also determine who is eligible to claim funding. They will produce the policy and procedures before they get the strategic plan in place. Ms. Whelan talked about priority setting, which determines the programs and projects competing for early funding. Ms. Whelan said the objective for the Project Team members is to provide the TAM Board and staff with tools and adequate data and analysis to make policy and priority decisions.

Ms. Whelan spoke about how to determine potential financing needs and capacity, such as capital projects with debt financing potential – bus transit facilities, Highway 101 HOV Gap Closure Project, etc. She said there are pros and cons to issuing debt to bring projects forward, such as expenses, issuance costs. Their first task is to look at the magnitude of the financing TAM will need, and refining what the assumption was (\$30M) in the sales tax expenditure plan.

Commissioner Swanson asked if there would be an overall assessment on the need for debt financing prior to hiring a financial advisor. He said he would be more comfortable looking at a detailed cash flow to see if there are other ways in which to borrow.

Commissioner Eklund asked if the expenditure plan was completely different and separate from the strategic plan. Trudy Presser said the strategic plan will reflect the expenditure plan; it is a separate document. ED Tackabery explained that the expenditure plan had to be adopted by a majority of the cities; the strategic plan has to be adopted only by the Authority. Chair Kinsey explained that the strategic plan takes the expenditure plan and prioritizes it, and develops policies and procedures to ensure the way we spend the money is consistent with the expenditure plan. Nolte Associates will bring monthly updates to TAM, and each Commissioner can make decisions about how they wish to go back to their cities and report. There will not be any month during which a decision is made that TAM will not have had discussion leading up to it. It is TAM's intention, as a convened body, to hear the reflection of the cities from each Commissioner.

Commissioner Murray said she has concerns about when to go out and bond the money for Highway 101 Gap Closure Project's Phase IV; the timing of this is important. Ms. Whelan said they are getting started on the cash flow model now and determining how soon TAM would need financing. They do not want to enter into any agreements for issuing debt until they know this. In the big picture, we need to get a funding plan in place for the Gap Closure Project, how to creatively leverage this plan, as this is where the big debts will be incurred, and review other capital elements of the plan to determine in needs. She feels she can have the cash flow model prepared within the next several months. Ms. Whelan said she would identify TAM's debt capacity.

In addition to the Gap Closure, ongoing transit support is critical, according to Commissioner Boro, and support of local roads and Safe Routes To Schools (SR2S). How much do we need each year for the ongoing commitment we have to bus service, the schools, the roads, and the Gap Closure? Ms. Whelan said she and

her team are currently creating a very simple spreadsheet to highlight capital projects which may be eligible for debt financing. One reason Ms. Whelan said they are anxious to complete the policy and procedures is that those project sponsors can come in; TAM can make its allocations to them soon, regarding the ongoing projects. Chair Kinsey said we need to look at the near-term and the mid-term (a 5-year reevaluation).

Karen Nygren of the Sierra Club spoke about the support for, and continuance of, SR2S. She said we have been promised that our transit service will continue 18 to 20 years from now. Ms. Nygren said that if we “front load ourselves” with debt, we have to put that debt into the mix: how much debt can we support?

Ms. Presser assured attendees that the strategic plan process is in place to address the exact concerns expressed here today.

Tom Matoff with LTK Engineering began the discussion of the Four Local Bus Transit System Strategies. He said the agency’s goal, and Strategy #1 is very progressive in their treatment of transit in the sales tax expenditure plan. There are a number of challenges on delivering on these; the level of funding is one of the key challenges. We have to implement through other agencies. A lot is going to have to be achieved through developing working relationships with the MCTD and with the GGBH&TD. It will be important to take the objectives and translate them into specific and appropriate actions and methodologies to introduce a more effective transit service.

Mr. Matoff recommends that TAM be formally involved in the technical development of the SRTP. Chair Kinsey said we have a working committee already formed for these types of meetings and planning.

To make transit attractive to those in their cars, Mr. Matoff said TAM will have to look at all existing services as something to leverage the available funds against. The GGBH&TD corridor service is very important to transit mobility. He said that TAM should develop a relationship with the GGBH&TD and participate in comprehensive service design.

Ron Downing from GGBH&TD said that under the new agreement with the MCTD, they have established a protocol for policy level board meetings throughout the year to discuss broad-based issues and service contracts. GGBH&TD has brought (first via CMA and now) TAM major service changes they were considering for the GGT system. As part of the agreement, they have established a monthly planning meeting process with the MCTD Transit Manager and discuss issues of interest, i.e., service design, for both parties. These meetings could welcome a representative from TAM to be included in those processes.

Connie Preston of Vali Cooper began the discussion of Strategy #2, commenting on the fact that it is an opportunity for Measure A and TAM to really shine on the completion of a successful project (Highway 101 Gap Closure). She will work with other team members on the scheduling of the projects and what the overall funding plan for both projects. Segment 4 is scheduled to begin construction in 2007. To support TAM staff, Ms. Preston said there are various agreements need to be put into place; an MOU, and an amendment of a funding agreement. Communication on the project, attending meetings, providing reports to both TAM staff so that they can feed information to the TAM Board, and any presentations will be a collaborative effort between staff and Ms. Preston. She will see to various stages of project management and quality assurance on all projects.

Ms. Preston is seeing to the project management specific to Segment 3 of the Highway 101 Gap Closure, via monitoring of its scope, schedule & budget, attending Caltrans’ meetings, plus coordinating a communications plan with Ben Strumwasser. Issues relating to Segment 4 - the Puerto Suello Hill portion of the Highway 101 Gap Closure - are getting attention now, such as the bike and ped path.

Hank Haugse of Nolte Associates began the discussion of Strategy #3, pertaining to infrastructure and regional and local roads. TAM is to consider whether certain roads are “project ready” and with Mr. Haugse’s assistance, develop project performance standards, considering all transportation modes. He said that regarding local roads, money that is provided to cities based on their specific projects, we need to develop performance standards and update the annual distribution formula, as identified in the sales tax expenditure plan. Mr. Haugse and his team will prepare cooperative agreements with the cities, which comes before the TAM Commissioners for approval.

Next, regarding Strategy #4, Mr. Haugse spoke about the Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S), featuring the existing SR2S program, crossing guards and the capital portion of Strategy #4, Safe Pathways to Schools. He offered items of recommendation for the TAM Commissioners to consider; the County of Marin currently administers the SR2S program. Will TAM take over the administration of this program?

The RFP process was illustrated, and after receiving public input with TAM’s approval, Mr. Haugse hopes to assist in issuing the RFP in April 2005. The question, as to which entity will administer the crossing guard program, was raised. Will TAM contract with other agencies to complete crossing projects? Will school districts be involved with some of the funding?

Commissioner Boro raised the question as to what Connie Preston and Hank Haugse’s roles are. ED Tackabery said that Connie Preston’s roll would be a daily administering of the Gap Closure Project. Mr. Haugse’s role is to work directly with the Public Works Directors, stakeholders, and with David Parisi to resolve issues relating to Strategies #3 and #4.

ED Tackabery requested feedback on the SR2S program; the thought being that TAM would take over the administration of the program. Regarding the crossing guard program, who should run it – the Office of Education, the police departments, school districts? Commissioner Gill asked if existing crossing guards were eligible for this program. ED Tackabery said this is a policy issue to discuss. Chair Kinsey said the idea of ‘match’ and overmatch’ needs to be rewarded, not punished.

Public comment included a question regarding local infrastructure, and where within the strategic plan would TAM address transit demand management systems. ED Tackabery said that this issue was identified in Strategy #3. Ms. Nygren said it is not spelled out within this process.

TAM is prepared, over time, to take on a lot of responsibilities; SR2S is one of those responsibilities. In this transitional period without staff expansion, Chair Kinsey asked if there is other staff, other than the current County dedicated staff, to manage the SR2S program. If TAM were to take on the program now without the luxury of additional staff, TAM will have a staffing problem. Chair Kinsey said TAM needs to hold steady for at least another year; the PMO team could assist with the program management. Commissioner Breen asked if the current school bus issue (i.e., in Ross Valley, San Anselmo) falls under Strategy #1. ED Tackabery explained that yes, it will become part of the MCTD discussion.

Ben Strumwasser with Circle Point began the discussion of Circle Point’s role in providing public outreach for TAM. “The recipe for success shouldn’t stop once the voters have spoken.” This was a quote from a recent newspaper article. Mr. Strumwasser spoke about some of the principles TAM anticipates as being important.

Mr. Strumwasser outlined some of the key components of the communications plan. They want to be clear about their objectives in communicating with the public. They need to establish communications protocols within TAM as well as related agencies. From existing lists, he’s compiled a fairly broad view of TAM’s audience. Public outreach activities should be tied to the technical activities.

Regarding identity development and branding of Measure A and individual components thereof, Mr. Strumwasser requested direction and feedback from TAM Commissioners. He suggested the consideration of creation of an overall TAM brochure to be made available to everyone, plus an annual report, and/or a newsletter. There will be public meetings, and possibly the creation of a speaker's bureau, plus celebrations/events where TAM Commissioners as well as constituents can mingle to learn of the introductions to programs and capital projects.

There will be on-going, self-perpetuated activities with relation to public education, awareness and involvement, according to Mr. Strumwasser. Certain activities will be tied to specific events, such as the Strategic Plan, SR2S, etc.

Commissioner Murray talked about webcasting the TAM meetings, as well as Internet posting of all related meeting documents. Mr. Strumwasser said there will need to be decisions due to the amount of resources available, and that everyone will have to set some priorities. He said he and his team will assist in updating the website. Commissioner Murray also requested a photo of the full TAM Board be taken for posting to the website.

Peter Martin with Wilbur Smith Associates will be leading the Congestion Management Program (CMP) portion of the whole program, in conjunction with John Eells. Mr. Martin explained the background of the CMP, which was mandated in 1990 by Propositions 111 and 116, and has required updates every 2 years. It has been a method or tool by which it is ensured that gas tax revenues are being spent properly among transportation programs.

Issues, such as those relating to land use, can be presented to stakeholders during the next CMP update. The current effort to update the CMP begins immediately, to reflect what the TAM Commissioners are interested in. Mr. Martin explained the 6 multi-modal elements of the CMP, including the transportation network adoption, land use analysis program, and a 7-year capital improvement plan. There are 8 performance measures of the CMP, including highway level of service, vehicle miles traveled on congested highways, jobs/housing balance, and transit headways and coordination.

Mr. Martin also spoke about MTC's community based transportation program, which is based upon environmental justice studies, pertaining to disadvantaged Bay Area communities with special transportation needs. In Marin, there are two areas, which qualify for the community based transportation plan grants: San Rafael Canal Area, and Marin City. Mr. Martin also explained the 5 stages of the community-based transportation process.

c. Discussion

Commissioner Eklund asked if the County/TAM is limited to the two chosen areas to participate in community based transportation plans. She said there are areas in Novato, which would qualify as well. Mr. Martin explained that MTC identified 24 communities. He said with recommendation from TAM, he would bring any additional areas of concern to the attention of MTC for their review and possible approval. Mr. Martin said that to initiate the process of adding communities to MTC's list, a review of an area's demographics would be needed, as well identifying if, in fact, an area warrants special consideration. Chair Kinsey suggested the City of Novato could obtain MTC's federal-level census data and criteria to identify whether a specific area would qualify for the program.

Commissioner Murray said that unfortunately the 2000 census is not relevant to the parts of Novato of concern. Novato has grown vastly, thus identifying a major need for transit within Novato. What purview

must TAM and the City of Novato work under to match MTC's criteria? Chair Kinsey said he would request MTC staff to bring a discussion of this issue to the TAM Commissioners at a future meeting.

Karen Nygren said she was very impressed by today's consultant presentation. She said she had concern about whether transit-oriented development would make it to the radar today, and to reengage the CWPA in this process.

ED Tackabery said the premise today was to introduce the consultant team, review the work items, and for staff to refine a contract for consideration at the TAM March 24th meeting.

5. Open Time for Items Not On the Agenda

None.

Chair Kinsey adjourned the TAM Special Workshop at 12:15 p.m.